



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/933,646	08/21/2001	Keith W. Grueneberg	YOR920010699US1	6671
75	7590 10/21/2004		EXAMINER	
Louis J. Percello			BARQADLE, YASIN M	
Intellectual Property Law Dept. IBM Corporation			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
P.O. Box 218			2153	
Yorktown Heights, NY 10598			DATE MAILED: 10/21/2004	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.



<u>. </u>			- lh
	Application No.	Applicant(s)	9/
	09/933,646	GRUENEBERG ET AL.	•
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit	
<u> </u>	Yasin M Barqadle	2153	
The MAILING DATE of this communication Period for Reply	appears on the cover sheet w	ith the correspondence address -	-
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR RE THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATIO - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFF after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication - If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory pe - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by st Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the m earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	DN. R 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a I. I reply within the statutory minimum of thi riod will apply and will expire SIX (6) MO atute, cause the application to become A	reply be timely filed rty (30) days will be considered timely. NTHS from the mailing date of this communica BANDONED (35 U.S.C. & 133).	ation.
Status			
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 2	1 August 2001.	•	
2a) ☐ This action is FINAL . 2b) ☑ 1	This action is non-final.	•	
3) Since this application is in condition for allo closed in accordance with the practice und		·	s is
Disposition of Claims			
4) ☐ Claim(s) 1-7 is/are pending in the application 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are with 5) ☐ Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6) ☐ Claim(s) 1-7 is/are rejected. 7) ☐ Claim(s) is/are objected to. 8) ☐ Claim(s) are subject to restriction and	drawn from consideration.		
Application Papers			
9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Exam	niner.		
10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a)	accepted or b)□ objected to	by the Examiner.	
Applicant may not request that any objection to	the drawing(s) be held in abeya	nce. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).	
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the cor 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	• •	` '
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119			
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for fore a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority document	nents have been received. nents have been received in a priority documents have been reau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	Application No received in this National Stage	
Attachment(s)			
 Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 	4) Interview	Summary (PTO-413) (s)/Mail Date	
 Notice of Draitsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-946) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>08/21/2001</u>. 		Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)	

DETAILED ACTION

Claims 1-7 are rejected.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language:

Claims 1-6 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Cuan et al USPUB (20020004824).

As per claim 1, Cuan et al teaches a computer system comprising:

a computer with one or more memories (fig. 104, memory 112), one or more central processing units (fig. 104, memory 114), and one or more interfaces to one or more networks (interfaces with network 122 and 106));

a tuplespace data structure (¶ 48 tuple data code for storing and transferring data in tuple data format) that identifies one or more server computers (¶ 48-50, web servers 304 and production servers 312-316, a geographic location for each server computer (¶21 and ¶ 48-50), and authorized (¶ 68), password-protected shared data fields (¶ 48) made available through the network to create an extranet image (snapshot of a staging area located within development server is established ¶ 40-42; ¶ 27-29); and

an extranet monitor software program that detects incoming messages from one or more requester server computers (\P 21, script software allows the control and monitoring of data destinations of remote disparate systems), being one of the server computers, determines a service required by the message (\P 89), stores a service request corresponding to the service in the tuplespace data structure along with the geographic location of the requester server computer and one or more destination server computer (\P 48-50), the destination server computers each being a server computer, the extranet monitor further routing the message to the destination computer (\P 21 and 89).

As per claim 2, Cuan et al teach the computer system, as in claim 1, where the extranet monitor receives an XMT, representation of a document list that matches the original request in response from the destination server computer and routes the document list to the requester server computer [¶ 76-80].

As per claim 3, Cuan et al teach the computer system, as in claim 1, where the extranet monitor receives an XML representation of a document in response from the destination server computer and routes the document to the requester server computer [\P 76-80 and [\P 89].

As per claim 4, Cuan et al teach the computer system, as in claim 1, where the extranet monitor determines which destination server computer or computers can respond to the request only from the set of server computers [[\P 62-64 and \P 76-80].

As per claim 5, Cuan et al teach the computer system, as in claim 1, where the service comprises any one or more of the following: a search for one or more documents, a retrieval of one or more documents, and a registration of the server computers for participation in the extranet [¶ 21 and 49].

As per claim 6, Cuan et al teach the computer system, as in claim 1, where each destination server computer define specific content that can be searched and retrieved from the destination server computer in response to messages from the extranet monitor [\P 21; \P 31-32 and \P 64-67].

Application/Control Number: 09/933,646

Art Unit: 2153

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole woul d have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claim 7 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Cuan et al USPUB. (20020004824) in view of Rizzi et al USPUB (20020102524).

As per claim 7, although Cuan et al shows substantial features of the claimed invention, he does not explicitly show XML representation of a document containing curricula content.

Nonetheless, this feature is well known in the art and would have been an obvious modification of the system disclosed by Cuan et al, as evidenced by Rezzi et al USPN. (20020102524).

In analogous art, Rezzi et al whose invention is about a system for developing instructional material using a content database, disclose XML representation of a document containing curricula content [¶ 61]. Giving the teaching of Rezzi et al, a person of ordinary skill in the art would have readily recognized the desirability and the advantage of modifying Cuan et al by employing the system of Rezzi et al so that instructional

material could conform with know standards which makes retrieving queried instructional content faster.

Conclusion

The prior made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Yasin Barqadle whose telephone number is 703-305-5971. The examiner can normally be reached on 9:00 AM to 5:30 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Glenn Burgess can be reached on 703-305-4792. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are 703-872-9306 for regular communications and 703-746-7238 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703-305-3900.

Yasin Barqadle

Art Unit 2153

FRANTZ B. JEAN PRIMARY EXAMINER